

## Interview Summary

Application No:  
**08/737,492**

Applicant(s)  
**Burmeister et al**

Examiner  
**Paul Prebilio**

Group Art Unit  
**3738**



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Paul Prebilio

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Leoneide Brennan

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Apr 21, 1998

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-20

Identification of prior art discussed:

Freitag (US 5,601,593)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The interview actually took place over 3 days April 17, 20, and 21, 1998, but April 21, 1998 is recorded because this is when the interview concluded. The Examiner proposed numerous amendments in order to put the claims in condition for allowance and to make the claims patentably distinct from Freitag. The Applicant's Representative stated that she would get back to the Examiner later in the day. The Examiner received no call back on April 17 so he telephoned the Applicant's Representative again on April 20, and it was determined that the Applicant must either decide to provoke an interference with the Freitag patent or amend the claims to make them patentably distinct in view thereof. Upon calling the Applicant's Representative on April 21, the Examiner was informed that the Applicant did not wish to make any amendments to the application. For this reason, the Examiner stated that he would issue an office action so that the Applicant could decide where to proceed from there.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.